Case 3:20-cv-00893-RS Document 20 Filed 04/30/20 Page 1 of 3

1 2	XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California MYUNG J. PARK Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
3	LINDA L. GANDARA, State Bar No. 194667 MICHAEL S. DORSI, State Bar No. 281865		
4	Deputy Attorneys General 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000		
5	San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 510-3802		
6	Fax: (415) 703-5480 E-mail: Michael.Dorsi@doj.ca.gov		
7	Attorneys for Defendants		
8			
9	IN THE UNITED STAT	TES DISTRICT	COURT
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DI	STRICT OF C	ALIFORNIA
11			
12	MIYOKO'S KITCHEN, INC.,	3:20-cv-00893	3-RS
13	Plaintiff,		
14	v.		ON AND PROPOSED TING BRIEFING
15	VADENIDOSS in hor official composity of		ON DEFENDANTS'
16	KAREN ROSS, in her official capacity as Secretary of the California Department of Food		
17	and Agriculture, and STEPHEN BEAM, in his official capacity as Branch Chief of the Milk	Date: Judge:	April 29, 2020 Honorable Richard Seeborg
18	and Dairy Food Safety Branch,	T:15.	N C
19	Defendants.	Trial Date: Action Filed:	Not Set February 6, 2020
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

1	STIPULATION		
2	WHEREAS, Defendants filed their Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 17) on Thursday, April 23		
3	2020, setting hearing on June 25, 2020, and		
4	WHEREAS, the briefing schedule under Northern District of California Local Rule 7-3		
5	would permit only two weeks for Plaintiff to respond and one week for Defendants to reply,		
6	reserving an unnecessary six weeks between the close of briefing and hearing, and		
7	WHEREAS, the parties conferred and prefer an alternate briefing schedule that will:		
8	(1) allow time to confer regarding negotiations that may result in settlement,		
9	(2) accommodate constraints on counsel's schedules arising from other matters, and		
10	(3) preserve two weeks between the reply brief and unchanged hearing date, and		
11	WHEREAS, Northern District of California Local Rule 6-1(b) requires the parties to obtain		
12	a court order when extending or shortening time in a way that alters a filing deadline, and		
13	THE PARTIES STIPULATE TO AND JOINTLY REQUEST THE COURT ORDER the		
14	following schedule for briefing Defendants' Motion to Dismiss:		
15	Plaintiff's Response Due: May 26, 2020		
16	Defendants' Reply Due: June 9, 2020		
17	Hearing Date (Unchanged): June 25, 2020		
18			
19	Dated: April 30, 2020 XAVIER BECERRA		
20	Attorney General of California MYUNG J. PARK Supervising Deputy Attorney Congress		
21	Supervising Deputy Attorney General		
22	/s/ Michael S. Dorsi MICHAEL S. DORSI Dorputy Attorney Conoral		
23	Deputy Attorney General Attorneys for Defendants		
24	Dated: April 30, 2020 GUPTA WESSLER PLLC		
25	<u>/s/ Deepak Gupta</u> Deepak Gupta		
26	Attorneys for Plaintiff		
27	As the attorney e-filing this document, Michael S. Dorsi attests that Deepak Gupta		
28	concurred in the filing of this document /s/Michael S. Dorsi		

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER 2 Plaintiff Miyoko's Kitchen and Defendants Karen Ross, in her official capacity as Secretary 3 of the California Department of Food and Agriculture, and Stephen Beam, in his official capacity 4 as Branch Chief of the Milk and Dairy Food Safety Branch, stipulated to a briefing schedule for 5 Defendants' Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 17). The parties attest that they prefer this schedule 6 and the schedule preserves in excess of two weeks between the deadline for the reply brief and 7 the hearing date. Accordingly, the Court finds good cause and, pursuant to Northern District of 8 California Local Rule 6-1(b), adopts the proposed schedule: 9 Plaintiff's Response Due: May 26, 2020 10 Defendants' Reply Due: June 9, 2020 Hearing Date¹ (Unchanged): June 25, 2020 11 12 IT IS SO ORDERED 13 14 Dated: April ____, 2020 15 HON. RICHARD SEEBORG 16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 17 18 42170210.docx 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 ¹ Defendants noticed this motion for June 25, 2020, as required under Northern District of 27 California Local Rule 7-2, while acknowledging that the hearing itself is automatically vacated pursuant to Northern District of California General Order 72. This Order does not alter the effect 28 of General Order 72 vacating the hearing.